



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,438	04/11/2001	Kazim Sevens	2238-080	5287

7590 05/06/2004

LOWELL W. GRESHAM, ESQ.
MESCHKOW & GRESHAM, P.L.C.
Suite 409
5727 North Seventh Street
Phoenix, AZ 85014

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2682

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/833,438

Applicant(s)

SEVENS ET AL.

Examiner

LEE NGUYEN

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 4/11/2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly

owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 15, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scarpa (US 5,487,186).

Regarding claim 15, Scarpa teaches a method of tuning to a desired frequency channel a radio-frequency receiver, said method comprising: operating a process-variant test circuit 122-132 (fig. 1) to estimate an actual center frequency of an intermediate frequency filter 110 (col. 8, lines 50-53); forming a tuning parameter in response to said estimated actual center frequency and said desired frequency channel (col. 8, lines 44-63); and applying said tuning parameter to a tunable local oscillator 112 which generates a local oscillator signal that, when mixed in a downconversion mixer 108 with an RF signal from said desired frequency channel, generates an IF signal exhibiting approximately said actual center frequency of said IF filter (col. 8, lines 44-64). Scarpa fails to teach having a common semiconductor substrate on which an intermediate frequency filter and a process-variant test circuit are formed. It is taken official notice that integrating all receiver's components in a single IC is conventionally well

known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the filter and the process variant circuits into the receiver's IC in order to reduce the size of the receiver.

Regarding claim 19, Scarpa inherently teaches the step of repeating (col. 4, lines 3-4).

Regarding claim 21, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 15.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 16-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 16, the prior art of record fails to teach the process-invariant circuit as claimed.

Regarding claim 17, the prior art of record fails to teach the process-variant circuit as claimed.

6. Claims 1-14, 20 are allowed.

Regarding claim 1, the prior art of record fails to teach the process-variant circuit that uses the same resistor-forming semiconductor process as the intermediate frequency filter and a control circuit coupled as claimed.

Regarding claim 20, the prior art of record fails to teach the formation of the intermediate frequency filter and the process-variant as claimed.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Sempel et al. (US 5,408,196) teaches tuning the oscillator corresponding to pass band of the bandpass filter (see entire document).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEE NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703)-308-5249. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, VIVIAN CHIN can be reached on (703) 308-6739.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 4/20/04
LEE NGUYEN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2682